Case 1.05-67-117-50-3LA	Document i Filed 06/22	1/2005 Page 1 01 2
	, the second sec	RECEIPT # 66413
•		AMOUNTS 250
		SUMMONS ISSUED M
		LOCAL RULE 4.1
XIXIAMATA CON Y	WAIVER FORM	
UNITED STA	MCF ISSUED	
DISTRICT (	BY DPTY, CLK, M7	
		DATE F-22.05
	X	
ANN MARIE ARBOUR,	x	
	X	
Plaintiff,	x	4.0
	x	
v.	X Civil Antinu No	
	x Civil Action No.	
THE MICROOPTICAL CORPORATION	, x ~ - 5 5	730 mm
	$\mathbf{x} \rightarrow 5 = 1$	
Defendant.	x & S	
	Y	2.2

MAGISTRATE JUDGE Wexander

#### **NOTICE OF REMOVAL**

Defendant THE MICROOPTICAL CORPORATION ("MicroOptical") files this Notice of Removal pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1441 and 1446 and hereby removes this action from the Superior Court of the Trial Court of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Bristol County (the "Superior Court") to the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts. As its reasons for removal, MicroOptical states:

- 1. Plaintiff Ann Marie Arbour commenced an action in the Superior Court against MicroOptical titled *Ann Marie Arbour v. Micro Optical*, Docket No. BRCV 2005-00783 (the "Pending Action"). MicroOptical is the sole defendant in the Pending Action. A true and correct copy of the Summons and Complaint in the Pending Action is attached hereto as Exhibit A.
- Plaintiff's Summons and Complaint were delivered to MicroOptical on August 2,
   Therefore, this Notice of Removal is timely.
- 3. In paragraphs 21-26 of her Complaint, Plaintiff seeks relief for an alleged violation of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. §2000e et seq., as amended ("Title VII"), and the American with Disabilities Act, 42 U.S.C. §12101 et seq. (the "ADA").

4. Based on those allegations, this action is a civil action over which this Court has jurisdiction. The Court's jurisdiction over Title VII claims arises under 42 U.S.C. §2000e-5(f)(3), which, in material part, provides as follows:

> Each United States district court and each United States court of a place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States shall have jurisdiction of actions brought under this subchapter.

The Court's jurisdiction over ADA claims arises under 42 U.S.C. § 12117(a), which states, in relevant part, that "[t]he powers, remedies, and procedures set forth in sections...2000e-5....of this title shall be the powers, remedies, and procedures this subchapter provides...to any person alleging discrimination on the basis of disability in violation of any provision of this chapter...."

- 5. Therefore, this Court has jurisdiction over all claims and all parties. The Court has jurisdiction over the Complaint pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1331, 42 U.S.C. 2000e-5(f)(3), and 42 U.S.C. §12117(a). The Complaint is properly removed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1441 and 1446.
- 6. The pending action is properly removed to this Court under 28 U.S.C. §§ 1441 and 1446 because it is pending in Bristol County, Massachusetts, which lies within this District.

Respectfully submitted,

THE MICROOPTICAL CORPORATION

By its attorneys,

Robert M. Hale (BBO #217170)

Erin S. Martino (BBO #658100)

GOODWIN PROCTER LLP

Exchange Place

Boston, MA 02109-2881

617.570.1000

Dated: August 1/2, 2005

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE I hereby certify that a true copy of the

Form #42

CIVIL ACTION

SUPERIOR COURT DEPT. OF THE TRIAL COURT

### COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

		No. PERCV 2005-G0783-1
	Ann Marie Arbour	, Plaintiff (s)
	Micro Optical	, Defendant(s)
(TO PI	LAINTIFF'S ATTORNEY:  PLEASE INDICATE TYPE OF ACTION IN  TORT — MOTOR VEHICLE TORT — CON  EQUITABLE RELIEF — OTHER.)	
/ .	SUMMONS	
	Named Defendant:	
You are	hereby summoned and required to serve upon	David R. Archto
service of this s judgment by de You are also req	ne complaint which is herewith served upon you, exclusive of the day of section will be taken against you for the relief duired to file your answer to the complaint in the comp	ervice. If you fail to do so, lemanded in the complaint. ne office of the Clerk of this
any claim which	therwise provided by Rule 13 (a), your answer really the plaintiff which arise it is the subject matter of the plaintiff's claim king such claim in any other action.	es out of the transaction or
Court, at Taunt of our Lord two A TRU	Housand and FIVE  F COPY, ATTEST: Magistrate  Magistrate  TE_8/2/05	de Ly.
	is issued pursuant to Rule 4 of the Massachusetts Rules of an one defendant is involved, the names of all defendants	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·

a separate summons is used for each defendant, each should be addressed to the particular defendant. If the Commonwealth or an officer of agency thereof is a defendant, the time to be inserted is 60 days.

#### COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS SUPERIOR COURT DEPARTMENT

	TAUNTON DIVISION
<b>г</b> ж?	part y
*	Bristol County Superior Court
*	T0013006 06783
*	Civil Docket No: BRCV 2005-06783-
*	
'Ale	
**	
* .	COMPLAINT
	* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

- 1. The Plaintiff, Ann Marie Arbour, is an individual residing at 254 Pearl Street Extension in Attleboro, Bristol County, Massachusetts.
- The Defendant, Micro Optical, is upon information and belief, a corporation duly organized and existing under the laws of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and maintains an office and a place of business at 33 Southwest Park, Westwood, Massachusetts.

#### **FACTS**

- 3. The Plaintiff began her employment with the Defendant on or about June 25, 2001 earning \$17,00 per hour.
- 4. During her employment with the Respondent, the Plaintiff had a brief dating relationship with a co-worker.
- After the relationship with her co-worker ended, the co-worker continued to make unwelcome advances towards the Defendant, causing the Plaintiff emotional distress and anxiety. In October of 2001, the Plaintiff's illness worsened and she was ultimately hospitalized.
- 6. At the conclusion of her hospitalization and upon return to work for the Defendant, the coworker began a series of cruel emotional harassment, creating a hostile environment.
- After making complaints to the Defendant about the co-worker's harassment, the Plaintiff was told that she must tolerate the behavior because the co-worker was an intricate part of the company.
- 8. The Plaintiff took a short leave of absence in November of 2002 to have surgery. She returned to her employ on or about November 18, 2002 and the hostile environment and harassment continued.

- After numerous complaints to the Defendant, the Plaintiff was told to take a leave of absence to 'pull herself together', which she did, returning to work on or about January 6, 2003; however, the harassment continued.
- 10. After several more complaints to the Defendant nothing was done to cease the co-worker's behavior.
- The harassment continued throughout the remainder of the Plaintiff's employ with the Defendant, causing her to seek treatment with John P. Rafterty, who ordered her not to return to work until the negative working environment was omitted from her place of employment. The Plaintiff requested a leave of absence and was granted same. The Plaintiff went out on long-term disability.
- 12. While out on long-term disability, the Plaintiff received notice from the Defendant stating that it did not feel that a hostile working environment existed and that they would do nothing to change the conditions. She was further notified that prior to her return to work, she would have to meet certain conditions, including: (1) submit a letter from the Plaintiff's doctor releasing her to return to work; and (2) she would have to disclose information pertaining to her religious beliefs.
- 13. The Plaintiff's long-term disability ended; however, the 'negative working environment' was not corrected; therefore the Plaintiff's doctor refused to release her back to work. Because her doctor refused to release her back to work, the Defendant would not allow her to return to work.
- 14. The Plaintiff's doctor would not release her back to work because the Defendant engaged in a series of attacks on the Plaintiff's religious beliefs.
- 15. The Plaintiff is a member of a religion that believes in witchcraft.
- 16. The Defendant would attack the Plaintiff's religious beliefs by having his employees sing or hum tunes from the Wizard of Oz.
- 17. The Defendant admitted under oath at an unemployment hearing that his employees did such but only because it was a product line that the company had been working on.
- 18. The Plaintiff repeatedly told the Defendant's supervisor that she found these comments and songs offensive and against her religious belief.
- 19. The Defendant did nothing to stop his employees from these attacks on the Plaintiff's religious beliefs.
- 20. The Plaintiff was terminated by the Defendant on October 23, 2003.

### COUNT I Discrimination Against a Disabled Person

- 21. The Plaintiff incorporates by reference all allegations set forth in Paragraphs 1 through 20 of this Complaint as it sets out in full herein.
- 22. The Plaintiff was a disabled person under the law.
- 23. The Plaintiff remained ready, willing and able to perform her duties under employment with the Defendant with reasonable accommodations.
- 24. The Defendant failed to provide the Plaintiff with reasonable accommodations.
- 25. The Defendant discharged the Plaintiff because her treating doctor would not release her to return to work without the necessary reasonable accommodations made and the Defendant would not allow the Plaintiff to return to work without being released by her doctor to do so.
- 26. By the above conduct, the Defendant is in direct violation of the Americans with Disabilities Act and Title VII.

### COUNT II Intentional Infliction of Emotional Distress

- 27. The Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations set forth in Paragraphs 1 through 26 of this Complaint as it sets out in full herein.
- The Defendant has intentionally inflicted emotional distress upon the Plaintiff.
- 29. The Plaintiff has suffered emotional distress, mental anxiety, loss of reputation and humiliation.

### COUNT III Negligent Infliction of Emotional Distress

- 30. The Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations set forth in Paragraphs 1 through 29 of this Complaint as it sets out in full herein.
- 31. The Defendant has negligently inflicted emotional distress upon the Plaintiff.
- 32. As a result, the Plaintiff has suffered emotional distress, mental anxiety, los of reputation and humiliation.

## COUNT IV Discrimination Based on Religion

- 33. The Plaintiff incorporates by reference the allegations set forth in Paragraphs 1 through 32 of this Complaint as it sets out in full herein.
- 34. The Defendant requested that the Plaintiff disclose her Religious Beliefs prior to returning to her position, which is a violation of the Plaintiff's rights.
- 35. The Defendant has an obligation to prohibit against disparate treatment based upon creed or religion; and a duty to make reasonable accommodations.

WHEREFORE, the Plaintiff respectfully prays this Honorable Court to advance this case on the docket, order a speedy hearing at the earliest practicable date, cause this case to be in every way expedited and upon such hearing to:

- Issue a declaratory judgment that the Defendant's acts, policies, practices and procedures complained of herein violated the Plaintiff's rights;
- Order the Defendant to make the Plaintiff whole by ordering damages for damages for loss of income and lost fringe benefits;
- Award damages for discrimination in accordance with the Americans with Disabilities
   Act;
- 4) Award damages for emotional distress and loss of reputation damages; and
- 5) Order such other and further relief as this Court deems just and proper.

PLAINTIFF REQUESTS TRIAL BY JURY.

Respectfully submitted,
ANN MARIE ARBOUR,
By and through her attorney,

David R. Ardito, Esquire Bates Building, Suite #215A 7 North Main Street Attleboro, MA 02703 1-508-431-2222 BBO# 630025 JS 44 (Rev. 3/99)

#### **CIVIL COVER SHEET**

The JS-44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleading or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judical Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)

	CTIONS ON THE REVERSE C	Jr THE FORM.)				<u>:</u>				
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS				DEFENDANTS						
Ann Marie Arbour			The MicroOptical Corporation							
	e of First Listed Plaintiff <u>B</u> CEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF C		County of Residence of First Listed Defendant (IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)  NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASEES, USE THE LOCATION OF THE LAND INVOLVED.							
(c) Attorney's (Firm Na	ame, Address, and Telephon	e Number)		Attores (Ethown)	1173	0				
David R. Ardito				Robert M. Pele	11/3	U DRC				
7 North Main Street, A	ttleboro, MA 02703 508	3-431-2222		Erin S. Martino						
•	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,			Goodwin Procter LLI	P, Exchange Place, Boston	, MA 617-570-1000				
II. BASIS OF JURIS	DICTION (Place and "X" in	One Box Only)			NCIPAL PARTIES(Place an					
☐ I U.S. Government Plaintiff	□ 3 Federal Questic     ( U.S. Government)	on rnment Not a	Citizen	DEF of This State						
☐ 2 U.S. Government  Defendant	☐ 4 Diversity (Indicate Cit		Citizen	of Another State 2	☐ 2 Incorporated and Princ					
	Parties in Ite	em III	Citizen	or Subject of a 3	of Business In An  ☐ 3 Foreign Nation	other State				
	-			eign Country						
IV. NATURE OF SUI				,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
CONTRACT		RTS		FORFEITURE/PENALTY	BANKRUPTCY	OTHER STATUTES				
110 Insurance	PERSONAL INJURY	PERSONAL INJU		610 Agriculture	☐ 422 Appeal 28 USC 158	400 State Reapportionment				
120 Marine	310 Airplane	☐ 362 Personal Injury- Malpractice	Med.	620 Other Food & Drug	423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157	410 Antitrust				
130 Miller Act	315 Airplane Product Liability	365 Personal Injury-	_	625 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC	PROPERTY RIGHTS	430 Banks and Banking				
☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument ☐ 150 Recovery of Over-	320 Assault, Libel &	Product Liability		630 Liquor Laws	820 Copyrights	450 Commerce/ICC Rates/etc.				
payment & Enforce-	Slander	368 Asbestos Person		640 R.R. & Truck	830 Patent	460 Deportation				
ment of Judgment	330 Federal Employers' Liability	lnury Product Li	ability	650 Airline Regs.	840 Trademark	470 Racketeer Influenced				
151 Medicare Act	340 Marine	PERSONAL PROPE	ERTY	660 Occupational		and Corrupt				
152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans	345 Marine Product	370 Other Fraud	1	Safety/Health		Organization  480 Consumer Credit				
(Excl. Veterans)	Liability	☐ 371 Truth in Lendin☐ 380 Other Personal	R	LJ 690 Other		490 Cable/Sat TV				
☐ 153 Recovery of Overpay- ment of Veteran's Benefits	☐ 350 Motor Vehicle ☐ 355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability	Property Damage  385 Property Damage		LABOR	SOCIAL SECURITY	810 Selective Service				
☐ 160 Stockholders' Suits	360 Other Personal Injury	Product Liability		710 Fair Labor Standards Act	☐ 861 HIA (13 95 ff)	ities/Exchange				
190 Other Contract			- 1	720 Labor/M gmt. Relations 730 Labor/Mgment.	862 Black Lung (923)	USC 3410				
☐ 195 Contract Product Lia-			-	Reporting & Disclosure	843 DIW C/DIW W (405 (g))	890 Other Statutory Actions				
bility  196 Franchise				Act	864 SSID Title XVI	891 Agricultural Acts				
	· ····			740 Railway Labor Act	☐ 865 RSI (405(g))	892 Economic Stabilization				
REAL PROPERTY	CIVIL RIGHTS	PRISONER PETIT		☐ 790 Other Labor Litigation ☐ 791 Empl. Ret. Inc. Security	FEDERAL TAXSUITS	Act				
210 Land Condemnation 220 Foreclosure	441 Voting	510 Motions to Vaca Septences	ite	Act	870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or	893 Environmental Matters				
220 Foreclosure 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment	442 Employment  443 Housing/Accom-				Defendant)	894 Energy Allocation Act 895 Freedom of Information				
240 Torts to Land	modations	Habeas Corpus:			D	Act				
245 Tort Product Liability	444 Welfare	530 General 535 Death Penalty			26 USC 7609	900 Appeal of Fee Deter-				
290 All Other Real Property	445 Amer. w/Disabilities - 540 Mondanus & Or		ther			mination				
	Employment  446 Aer. w/Disabilities -	550 Civil Rights				Under Equal Access to				
	Other	☐ 535 Prison Conditio	n			Justice  950 Constitutionality of State				
	440 Other Civil Rights					Statutes State				
	PLACE AN "X" IN ONE BOX	ONLY)		Т	ransferred from	Appeal to District				
☐ 1 Original Proceeding	State Court	3 Remanded from Appellate Court		Reopened (s	nother district	7 Judge from Magistrate Judgment				
	Cite the U.S. Civil Statute	under which you are filing	(Do not cit	te jurisdictional statutes unless diver	rsity):					
VI. CAUSE OF ACT	ION 28 U.S.C. 8 1441	and 1446: 42 H S	C 3000	e et seq., 42 U.S.C. § 120	110 at sag					
C.100L OF ACT	Brief description of cause:			-						
Y	Alleged violations	of Title VII of Ci	vil Rigl	hts Act and Americans wi	th Disabilities Act relating	to employment				
VII. REQUESTED IN	N □ CHE	CK IF THIS IS A CI	LASS A	CTION DEMANDS		if demanded in complaint				
COMPLAINT		DER F.R.C.P. 23			JURY DEMAND:	⊠ Yes □ No				
VIII. RELATED CAS	SE(S) (See instructions):									
IF ANY		JUDGE			DOCKET NUMBER					
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY	SIGN	IATURE OF ATTORNEY	OF RECO	RD SAM JOA	7					
				•						
RECEIPT # A LIBB/1364694.1	TOUNT	APPLYING IFP		JUDGE	MAG. JUDGE	-				

# Case 1:05-cv-11730-JLA<sub>UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT</sub> Page 2 of 2 DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

C	ategory	in w	hich the case belon	gs based upon t	the numbered nat	ure of sui	t code	listed	on the	civil (	cover sheet	t. (See local	rule 40.1(a)(2
	] [.		160, 410, 470, R.2	3, REGARDLI	ESS OF NATUR	E OF SUI	T.					5	
×	II.		195, 368, 400, 440 740, 790, 791, 820							_	te AO 120 o ademark or o	or AO 121 copyright cases	5
	] III.		110, 120, 130, 140 315, 320, 330, 340 380, 385, 450, 89	), 345, 350, 355									
	] IV.	•	220, 422, 423, 430 690, 810, 861-865			_		า	ๆ เ	7	2 A	TYP	C.
	] v.		150, 152, 153.		¥	(D)		T	<u>F</u>		JU	PR	A STATE OF THE STA
		he ti	ber, if any, of relate			). If more	than	one pr	rior rela	ated ca	ase has bee	n filed in this	s district pleas
Н	as a prie	or ac	tion between the sa	me parties and	based on the sam	e claim e	ver be	en file	d in thi	is cou	rt?		
							YES			NO	X		
			plaint in this case q	uestion the con	stitutionality of a	n act of c	ongres	s affe	cting th	ne pub	lic interest	? (See	
28	8 USC §	240	03)				YES			NO	X		
If	so, is th	ne U	S.A. or an officer,	agent or employ	yee of the U.S. a		YES			NO			
Is	this cas	е ге	quired to be heard a	and determined	by a district cour	t of three	judges	s pursi	uant to	title 2	8 USC §22	284?	
							YES			NO	$\times$		
			parties in this action al agencies"), resid										husetts
		A.	If yes, in which di	vision do <u>all</u> of	the non-governn		YES ties re:	⊠ side?		NO			
			Eastern Division	$\boxtimes$	Central Di	ivision [				West	tern Divisi	on 🗆	
		B.	If no, in which div Massachusetts res		ajority of the plai	ntiffs or tl	he only	y parti	es, exc	luding	g governme	ental agencies	s, residing in
			Eastern Division		Central Di	ivision [	$\exists$			West	tern Divisi	on 🗆	
			ice of Removal – a identifying the mo	tions)	tions pending in			_	ng the a			Court? (If ye	s, submit a
			See attachmen	t.			YES	Ш		NO	$\boxtimes$		
LEA			OR PRINT)	Manatin a									
OT	RNEY'	3 JN/	AME Erin S. I	viartino									